



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,830	01/19/2001	Satish Sundar	3492/ALRT/DD/BCVD/JW	9916

32588 7590 03/27/2003

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.  
2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061  
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER
----------

UNDERWOOD, DONALD W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3652

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Art Unit

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <sup>3</sup> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/22/03
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5-15, 18-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) None is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5-15, 18-29 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5-15, 18-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s)        is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s)        are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on        is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on        is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.       .  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)        6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3652

### Detailed Action

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/20/02 has been entered.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, it appears "to be" in line 1 should be deleted. Note "mounted" in line

3.

In claim 11, it appears "to be" in line 1 should be deleted. Note mounted in line 3.

In claims 24-29, the method steps should be active steps. For example, in claim 1, "rotate" in line 6 and "rotation" in line 7 should each be --rotating--, "continue" in line 9 and line 10 should be --continuing-- and --extending-- should be inserted after "rotation" in line 10 and "extend" in line 11 should be deleted. Also note "their respective extended positions" in line 11 should have clear antecedent basis. One way of doing this would be to delete "displacably" in lines 2 and 4 and insert --extendably--.

Art Unit: 3652

Regarding claim 25, this claim should be correlated with the active steps in claim 24.

Regarding claims 27-29, these claims should contain active steps.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 5-14 and 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Bacchi et al '444.

Regarding claims 24-29, note figure 10 wherein each blade can be moved to an aligned position A or an offset position B or C.

Regarding claims 10 and 23, the 2 to 1 ratio is standard for a straight line movement and each Bacchi reference illustrates straight line movement in figure 3.

6. Claims 1, 5-14, and 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Bacchi et al '768.

Regarding claims 24-29, note figure 9.

Regarding claims 10 and 23, the remarks set forth in the preceding paragraph are herein repeated.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3652

8. Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacchi et al '444 or '768 in view of Hiruma et al.

It would have been obvious to use a stepper motor for each motor in either primary reference in view of the teaching in Hiruma to provide a weight saving.

9. Applicant's arguments regarding the rejections under 35 USC 102 have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The claims, excluding claims 5 and 18, set forth a main robot link. This does <sup>not</sup> require a single element. The link could be elements 14L, 11 and 14R of Bacchi '444 with 30L and 30R being blades and 22L and 22R being arms and with 62L and 62R being first hubs and 82L and 82R being second hubs. Bacchi '768 contains similar structure. Regarding claims 5 and 18, if 11 in Bacchi '444 is considered to be the main robot link then 22L and 22R are still arms with 14L and 14R being a connector between the main link and the arms. One way of obviating the 102 rejections would be to rewrite claims 5 and 18 in independent and further reciting that the arms are directly mounted to the link.

10. Applicant's arguments regarding claims 24-29 have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The method claims do not require a unitary link and thus the Bacchi references meet the method since the links 14L and 14R in Bacchi '444 and 68L and 68R in Bacchi '768 are part of the link and move together with arms 22L and 22R and 62L and 62R respectively to extend the blades into a stack.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to D. Underwood at telephone number (703) 308-1113.

Underwood/kl  
March 21, 2003

*[Signature]* 03/24/03  
RONALD W. UNDERWOOD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER